



ASGSR 2016



# **Biomechanical Modeling of Split-leg Squat and Heel Raise on the Hybrid Ultimate Lifting Kit (HULK)**

**William K. Thompson (presenter)**

**Christopher A. Gallo**

**Beth E. Lewandowski**

NASA

**Kathleen M. Jagodnik**

Baylor College of Medicine

**Brad T. Humphreys**

**Justin H. Funk**

**Nathan W. Funk**

ZIN Technologies

**John K. DeWitt**

KBR/Wyle

**American Society for Gravitational and Space Research - Annual Meeting**


**October 29, 2016**



# Digital Astronaut Project – Load Configuration



- Same subject, objectives and methods as the preceding Gallo presentation
- These exercises
  - Split-leg squat (SLS)
  - Heel Raise (HR) (still in progress)
- Load configuration analysis is the primary focus of this presentation
- We also have data available for stance and cadence variations





# Exercises and Load Configurations



How does the loading method affect localized physiological outcomes on HULK for exercises of interest?

## Split-leg squat (SLS)



Free weight  
“Gold standard”



HULK  
Long Bar



HULK  
Harness\*



HULK  
T-Bar





## Heel Raise (HR)

\* Yo-yo Technologies  
<http://www.yoyotechnologies.com/products/yoyo-squat/>






# Major Findings for SLS





# Comparison of Live Video and OpenSim Model Kinematics for SLS








# SLS Load Configuration Analysis - Kinematics




Hip



Knee

- Harness posture is more “upright” vs. long bar
  - Less hip and knee flexion over the course of the rep
- Hip abduction (not shown) remains <10 deg for all three load cases throughout the movement






# SLS Load Configuration Analysis – Ground Reaction Forces



Long Bar




Harness


Target Leg

Back Leg

Normal



Shear




- Harness shifts the subject's load distribution more onto the back foot relative to both long bar and free weight
- Shear forces are higher with the harness




# SLS Load Configuration Analysis – Centers of Pressure Loci in Target Foot




Free Weight



Long Bar



Harness



- Long Bar COP locus shifts more laterally toward mid-foot vs. free weight
- Harness COP locus shifts more forward (toward toe) and slightly more medially vs. free weight and long bar







# SLS Load Configuration Analysis – Joint Torques (Inverse Dynamics)



Hip



Knee



- Harness exercise produces less hip and knee torque vs. long bar over the course of the rep
- Long bar vs. free weight exhibits only minor differences





# SLS Load Configuration Analysis – Kinetics: Hip Muscle Forces and EMG



## Muscle Forces



## EMG Envelope

### Hip Extensors (Glutes)



- Harness reduces estimated muscle forces in agonist muscles
- Consistent with reduction in target leg GRF, joint torque and EMG responses
- MVC normalizations differ among trials since data were acquired on different days

### Hip Flexors (RecFem)







# SLS Load Configuration Analysis – Kinetics: Knee Muscle Forces and EMG



## Knee Extensors (Quads)




## EMG Envelope



- Free Weight appears to activate the knee extensors earlier in the lift.
- Harness case shows much less hip extensor activation than the bar cases.
- Harness case shows more uniform knee flexor activation over the course of the lift.

## Knee Flexors (Hamstrings)



No data







## Discussion of SLS findings to date

- Using the harness (vs. long bar):
  - The subject places more weight on the non-exercising leg and shear GRFs increase
  - COP shifts more forward and medially in the target foot
  - A small ( $<50$  N-m) knee flexion moment occurs in the exercising leg at the top of the movement
  - Range of motion increases (+15% ) at both hip and knee joints
  - Peak joint moments decrease in the hip (-29%) and knee (-6%)
  - Peak hip extensor (-37%) and knee extensor (-8%) muscle forces decrease
- These single-subject results suggest that exercise at a higher applied load with the harness may be needed to impart the same exercise stimulus as with the long bar.
- Modeling can help to quantify this difference in other subjects




# Preliminary Findings for Heel Raise







# Comparison of Live Video and OpenSim Model Kinematics for Heel Raise



- Only kinematic and EMG results will be presented here
- Some key single-tether data are still needed to complete the analyses
- Plan to acquire data in Nov 2016







# HR Load Configuration Analysis - Kinematics



- Ranges of motion in the ankle and MTP joint are general highest for the harness
- The subject adopted a motion to lengthen the free weight and T-Bar concentric phases vs. the long bar and harness concentric phases
- There is a noticeable hesitation followed by a punctuated movement when using the T Bar






# EMG Comparison for HR



- The shape of the gastrocnemius activation profile is relatively consistent across loading configurations
- MVC normalizations differ among trials since data were acquired on different days





# Looking Forward



- Plan to publish load configuration analysis findings when complete
- Incorporate deadlift findings into load configuration analysis (Jagodnik)
- Will continue modeling efforts to inform and support the development of exercise countermeasure devices on NASA deep space missions
- Incorporate predictive models to provide kinematic estimations for situations where motion capture is impractical (e.g., microgravity)





# Questions?



## Thank you for listening!



# Problem Statement

- Given the small size of the MPCV exercise device, will it be able to provide sufficient physiological loading to maintain musculoskeletal performance?
- Advanced Exercise Concepts Project Risk:
  - Single-tether design may limit exercise performance (?)
- Advance Exercise Concepts Project Requirement:
  - The device shall allow the crew member to perform squat, deadlift and heel raise exercises with proper body positioning\*




\*according to JSC-29558, "Resistive Exercise Description Document"



# Biomechanical Modeling and Simulation (M/S)



- Human exercises/movements
- Primarily resistance training
  - Regular squat (SQ)
  - Split-leg squat (SLS)
  - Heel-raise (HR)
  - Deadlift (DL)
- Using measured input data
  - Motion history (kinematics)
  - Applied forces
    - Ground Reaction Forces (GRF)
    - Device loads
  - Subject's anthropometrics
- Estimate outcomes
  - Muscle forces and moment arms
  - Joint torques
  - Mechanical loads (bones/joints)









# Methods: Data Collection



- GRC Exercise Countermeasures Lab (ECL)
- 3 sessions: APR, JUL, OCT 2015
- Mocap, EMG and force data are synced.
  - Motion capture: BTS Smart-D®, 12 camera system, 100 Hz sampling
  - Ground Reaction Forces (GRF): Kistler® Model 9261 force plates, 100 Hz sampling
  - Device loads: load cells internal to HULK
- EMG: BTS FreeEMG 16 wireless sensors
  - 1000Hz sampling
  - Band pass filtered 20-450 Hz
  - Full wave rectified, RMS envelope
  - MVC normalized
- 1 subject for this data set






# Methods: EMG



Sensor      Muscle location

Blue 1	Tibialis Anterior
Blue 2	Vastus Medialis
Blue 3	Rectus Femoris
Blue 4	Vastus Lateralis
Blue 5	Hip Adductors
Blue 6	Rectus Abdominis
Blue 7	External Obliques
Blue 8	Medial Gastrocnemius
Red 1	Lateral Gastrocnemius
Red 2	Semitendinosus
Red 3	Biceps Femoris
Red 4	Gluteus Maximus
Red 5	Multifidus
Red 6	Longissimus
Red 7	Middle Trapezius
Red 8	Upper Trapezius



## • EMG Processing

- Sampling rate = 1000 Hz
- Band pass filtering: 20 to 450 Hz,
- Full-wave rectified and enveloped with RMS calculation
- EMG activation levels (0.0 to 1.0) normalized to the subject's MVC
- MVC tests were performed prior to application of the mocap markers.

- Muscles isolated for testing according to: Hislop HJ, Avers D, Brown M, Daniels and Worthingham's Muscle Testing: Techniques of Manual Examination and Performance Testing, 9th Edition, Elsevier Saunders, St. Louis, MO, 2014.







# Methods: Biomechanical Models in OpenSim



- OpenSim (Stanford Univ.) is freely available biomechanical simulation software allowing users to
  - Develop models of musculoskeletal structures
  - Create dynamic simulations of movement and kinematics
  - Calculate estimates for muscle and joint kinetics
- Used a modified and scaled version of the Rajagopal\* (2016) lower body model from OpenSim



\*Rajagopal, A., Dembia, C.L., DeMers, M.S., Delp, D.D., Hicks, J.L., and Delp, S.L., "Full body musculoskeletal model for muscle-driven simulation of human gait," (in review, submitted to IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering) (2016).



Long Bar HR



Harness Squat



T-Bar Heel Raise





# Methods: OpenSim Work Flows



For detailed explanation of the workflow steps, refer to the OpenSim User's Guide.

<http://simtk-confluence.stanford.edu:8080/display/OpenSim/User%27s+Guide>

## Model Scaling

Match the model to the subject's anthropometric measurements

## Inverse Kinematics (IK)

Compute the **joint angles** that best replicate the marker position history

## Inverse Dynamics (ID)

Determine the net **joint forces and joint torques** based on kinematics

## Static Optimization (SO)

Extend ID to resolve the net **muscle group forces** at each instant in time

EMG  
Validation

(iteration among steps is assumed)



# Methods: Statistical Analysis in Matlab



- Determine rep start and stop times from a marker trajectory
- Resample outcomes onto a normalized time vector from 0.0 to 1.0
- Compute ensemble average
- Perform statistical analysis at each increment ( $\mu$  and  $\sigma$ )

